arXiv:1609.07339v1 [math.PR] 23 Sep 2016

Implicit renewal theory in the arithmetic case

Péter Kevei
Center for Mathematical Sciences, Technische Universität München
Boltzmannstraße 3, 85748 Garching, Germany
peter.kevei@tum.de

Abstract

We extend Goldie's implicit renewal theorem to the arithmetic case, which allows us to determine the tail behavior of the solution of various random fixed point equations. It turns out that the arithmetic and nonarithmetic cases are very different. Under appropriate conditions we obtain that the tail of the solution X of the fixed point equations $X \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} AX + B$, $X \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} AX \vee B$ is $\ell(x)q(x)x^{-\kappa}$, where q is a logarithmically periodic function $q(xe^h) = q(x)$, $x > 0$, with h being the span of the arithmetic distribution of $\log A$, and ℓ is a slowly varying function. In particular, the tail is not necessarily regularly varying. We use the renewal theoretic approach developed by Grincevičius and Goldie.
Keywords: Perpetuity equation; maximum of perturbed random walk; implicit renewal theorem; arithmetic distribution; iterated function system.
MSC2010: 60H25, 60K05.

1 Introduction

Consider the perpetuity equation

$$X \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} AX + B, \tag{1}$$

where (A, B) and X on the right-hand side are independent. The tail behavior of the solution has attracted much attention since Kesten's result [20]. This result was rediscovered by Grincevičius [17], whose renewal theoretic method was developed further and applied to more general random fixed point equations by Goldie [16]. They proved the following.

Theorem. (Kesten–Grincevičius–Goldie) *Assume that $A \geq 0$ a.s., $\mathbf{E}A^\kappa = 1$ for some $\kappa > 0$, $\mathbf{E}A^\kappa \log_+ A < \infty$, $\mathbf{E}|B|^\kappa < \infty$ and the distribution of $\log A$ conditioned on $A \neq 0$ is nonarithmetic. Then*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} x^\kappa \, \mathbf{P}\{X > x\} = c_+, \quad \lim_{x\to\infty} x^\kappa \, \mathbf{P}\{X < -x\} = c_-.$$

Furthermore, if $\mathbf{P}\{Ax + B = x\} < 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then $c_+ + c_- > 0$.

Besides perpetuity equation (1) the best known and most investigated random fixed point equation is the maximum equation

$$X \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} AX \vee B, \tag{2}$$

where $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$, $A \geq 0$ and (A, B) and X on the right-hand side are independent. This equation appears in the analysis of the maximum of a perturbed random walk. Under the same assumptions Goldie proved the same tail behavior of the solution. For theory, applications and history of perpetuity equation (1) we refer to Buraczewski, Damek and Mikosch [7] and for perturbed random walks and maximum equation (2) to Iksanov [19].

Interestingly enough, the case when $\log A$ is arithmetic was only treated by Grincevičius in the perpetuity case and by Iksanov [19] in the maximum case, see their theorems below. In both cases the tail has a completely different behavior than in the nonarithmetic case. In particular, the tail is not regularly varying. Investigating the maximum of random walks the maximum equation (2) appears with $B \equiv 1$. In this case the tail behavior was analyzed by Asmussen [3, XIII. Remark 5.4] and by Korshunov [23].

The aim of the present paper is to extend Goldie's implicit renewal theorem to the arithmetic case, providing a unified approach for random fixed point equations. This is done in Subsection 2.1. As an example we prove that the St. Petersburg distribution is a solution of an appropriate perpetuity equation, showing that the tail of a solution can be irregular. We also show that the set of possible functions appearing in the tail of the solution is large. In Subsection 2.2 we treat the case when the condition $\mathbf{E}A^\kappa \log_+ A < \infty$ does not hold, while Subsection 2.3 deals with the case $\mathbf{E}A^\kappa < 1$, but $\mathbf{E}A^t = \infty$, for $t > \kappa$. The corresponding nonarithmetic versions were treated by Kevei [22]. In each case we give the general implicit renewal theorem and then specialize it to the two equations (1) and (2). Finally, in Subsection 2.4 using Alsmeyer's sandwich technique [1] we show how these results apply to iterated function systems. All the proofs are contained in Section 3.

2 Results and discussion

A random variable Y, or its distribution, is called *arithmetic* (also called centered arithmetic, or centered lattice) if $Y \in h\mathbb{Z} = \{0, \pm h, \pm 2h, \ldots\}$ a.s. for some $h > 0$. The largest such an h is the span of Y. We stress the difference between arithmetic and lattice distributions, where the latter means $Y \in a + h\mathbb{Z}$ a.s. for some a, h.

Assume that $\mathbf{E}A^\kappa = 1$ for some $\kappa > 0$, which is the so-called Cramér condition (for $\log A$). Due to the multiplicative structure in (1) and (2), the key idea, which goes back to Grincevičius, is to introduce a new probability measure

$$\mathbf{P}_\kappa\{\log A \in C\} = \mathbf{E}[I(\log A \in C)A^\kappa], \tag{3}$$

where C is a Borel set of $\mathbb{R}$, and $I(B)$ is the indicator function of the event B, i.e. it is 1 if B holds, and 0 otherwise. Under the new measure the distribution function (df) of $\log A$ is

$$F_\kappa(x) = \mathbf{P}_\kappa\{\log A \leq x\} = \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{\kappa y} F(\mathrm{d}y), \tag{4}$$

where $F(x) = \mathbf{P}\{\log A \leq x\}$. We use the convention $\int_a^b = \int_{(a,b]}$ for $-\infty < a < b < \infty$. Note that without any further assumption on the distribution of A we have

$$F_\kappa(-x) \leq e^{-\kappa x} \quad \text{for } x > 0. \tag{5}$$

Under the new measure equations (1), (2) can be rewritten as renewal equations, where the renewal function is

$$U(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_\kappa^{*n}(x), \tag{6}$$

$*n$ standing for the usual n-fold convolution. Then the tail asymptotics can be obtained via the key renewal theorem in the arithmetic case on the whole line (note that $\log A$ can be negative). If $\mathbf{E}_\kappa \log A < \infty$, to which we refer as the 'finite mean case', the required key renewal theorem is given in [19, Proposition 6.2.6]. In the 'infinite mean case', when $\mathbf{E}_\kappa \log A = \infty$, but F_κ has regularly varying tail we prove an infinite mean key renewal theorem in the arithmetic case in Lemma 2, which is an extension of Erickson's result [13, Theorem 3]. Finally, when Cramér's condition does not hold, i.e. $\mathbf{E}A^\kappa = \theta \in (0,1)$, $\mathbf{E}A^t = \infty$, $t > \kappa$, one ends up with a defective renewal equation, for which a key renewal theorem is given in Lemma 3.

2.1 Finite mean case

Our assumptions on A are the following:

$$\begin{gathered} A \geq 0,\ \mathbf{E}A^\kappa = 1 \text{ for some } \kappa > 0,\ \mathbf{E}A^\kappa \log_+ A < \infty, \\ \text{and } \log A \text{ conditioned on } A \neq 0 \text{ is arithmetic with span } h. \end{gathered} \tag{7}$$

Note that the convexity of the function $\mathbf{E}A^s$, $s \in [0,\kappa]$ and $\mathbf{E}A^0 = \mathbf{E}A^\kappa = 1$ together implies $\mathbf{E}_\kappa \log A = \mathbf{E}A^\kappa \log A =: \mu > 0$. Moreover, (5) implies that $\mathbf{E}_\kappa[(\log A)_-]^2 < \infty$. Therefore the renewal function U in (6) is well-defined, see Theorem 2.1 by Kesten and Maller [21].

For a real function f the set of its continuity points is denoted by C_f. Introduce the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q} = \Big\{ & q : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty) \,:\, x^{-\kappa} q(x) \text{ is nonincreasing for some } \kappa > 0, \\ & q(xe^h) = q(x),\ \forall x > 0,\ \text{for some } h > 0 \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

In all the statements below a function $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ appears in the tail asymptotics. Note that $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ is either strictly positive or identically 0. The following result is a counterpart of Goldie's implicit renewal theorem [16, Theorem 2.3] in the arithmetic case.

Theorem 1. *Assume (7) and for a random variable X*

$$\int_0^\infty y^{\kappa-1} |\mathbf{P}\{X > y\} - \mathbf{P}\{AX > y\}| \mathrm{d}y < \infty, \tag{8}$$

where A and X are independent. Then there exists a function $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that for $x \in C_q$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x^\kappa e^{\kappa n h} \mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q(x). \tag{9}$$

Moreover, if

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{\kappa(x+jh)} \big|\mathbf{P}\{X > e^{x+jh}\} - \mathbf{P}\{AX > e^{x+jh}\}\big| < \infty, \quad \textit{for each } x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{10}$$

then (9) holds for all $x > 0$.

Whenever q is continuous the exact tail asymptotic can be determined. In Proposition 1 below, we show that q indeed can be continuous.

Lemma 1. *If the function $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ in (9) is nonzero and continuous, then*

$$\mathbf{P}\{X > x\} \sim \frac{q(x)}{x^{\kappa}} \quad as \;\; x \to \infty. \tag{11}$$

Similar behavior appears in the theory of semistable and max-semistable laws, and in the theory of smoothing transformaiton. If $\kappa \in (0, 2)$ then $q(x)x^{-\kappa}$ is exactly the tail of the Lévy measure of a semistable law with $q \in \mathcal{Q}$. For $\kappa > 0$ the function $\exp\{-q(x)x^{-\kappa}\}$, $x > 0$, is a max semistable distribution function. For more in this direction we refer to Meerschaert and Scheffler [25] and Megyesi [26, 27].

The smoothing transformation is closely related to our setup. Consider the fixed point equation

$$X \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} A_1X_1 + \ldots + A_NX_N, \tag{12}$$

where $X_1, \ldots, X_N$ are iid copies of X, $A_1, \ldots, A_N$ are iid, and the A's and X's are independent. Durrett and Liggett [12] gave necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of the solution of (12). Assuming existence, let φ be the Laplace-transform of the solution. In [12, Theorem 2] it is shown that, under appropriate conditions, $1 - \varphi(t) \sim t^{\alpha}h(t)$ as $t \to 0$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, where h is a logarthmically periodic function. It is not clear how the tail behavior can be inferred from these results, since to apply Tauberian theorems regular variation is necessary. For more results and references see Alsmeyer, Biggins and Meiners [2], in particular Corollary 2.3 and Theorem 3.3.

Finally, we mention that functions of the form $f(x) = p(x)e^{\lambda x}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, where p is a periodic function, are the solutions of certain integrated Cauchy functional equations, see Lau and Rao [24].

Consider the perpetuity equation (1). We present Grincevičius's result in the arithmetic case below. The slight improvement is the positivity of q, which follows from Goldie's argument [16, p. 157] combined with Theorem 1.3.8 [19] by Iksanov.

Theorem 2. (Grincevičius [17, Theorem 2]) *Assume (7) and $\mathbf{E}|B|^{\kappa} < \infty$. Let X be the unique solution of (1). Then there exist functions $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} x^{\kappa}e^{\kappa nh}\mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q_1(x), \quad x \in C_{q_1}, \\ &\lim_{n\to\infty} x^{\kappa}e^{\kappa nh}\mathbf{P}\{X < -xe^{nh}\} = q_2(x), \quad x \in C_{q_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

If $\mathbf{P}\{Ax + B = x\} < 1$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then $q_1(x) + q_2(x) > 0$.

Grincevičius also showed that (13) holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if $B \geq 0$ a.s.

The corresponding maximum equation was treated by Iksanov.

Theorem 3. (Iksanov [19, Theorem 1.3.8]) *Assume (7) and $\mathbf{E}|B|^{\kappa} < \infty$. Let X be the unique solution of (2). Then there exists a function $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that for any $x > 0$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x^{\kappa}e^{\kappa nh}\mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q(x). \tag{14}$$

If $B \geq 0$ a.s. and $\mathbf{P}\{B > 0\} > 0$ then $q(x) > 0$.

In fact this theorem is stated under the additional condition $B > 0$ a.s. In the context of [19] this condition automatically holds since $B = e^{\eta}$ for some random variable η.

Note the difference between the two theorems. In case of equation (2) it is possible to show that the stronger condition (10) holds (see the proof of [19, Theorem 1.3.8]), while in the perpetuity case (1) one only has the weaker condition (8).

The formula for the function $q(x)$ (given in the proof below) in Theorem 1 is complicated and implicit, since it contains the tail of the solution X. Therefore one might think that $q(x) \equiv c$ and the tail is simply $cx^{-\kappa}$ as in the nonarithmetic case. We first give an explicit example which shows that this is not the case, i.e. the function q can be nonconstant.

Example. The St. Petersburg game is defined as follows. Peter tosses a fair coin until it lands heads and pays 2^k ducats to Paul if this happens at the kth toss. If X denotes Paul's winning then $\mathbf{P}\{X = 2^k\} = 2^{-k}$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. The distribution function of X is

$$\mathbf{P}\{X \le x\} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{2^{\{\log_2 x\}}}{x}, & x \ge 2, \\ 0, & x < 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} : \, k \le x\}$ is the usual (lower) integer part of x, $\lceil x \rceil = -\lfloor -x \rfloor$ stand for the upper integer part and $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ is the fractional part. We note that this distribution does not belong to the domain of attraction of any stable law, since the function $2^{\{\log_2 x\}}$ is not slowly varying at infinity. For further properties and history of the St. Petersburg games we refer to [9] and [5] and the references therein.

We show that X is the solution of a perpetuity equation, where the joint distribution of (A, B) in (1) is the following:

$$\mathbf{P}\{A = 0, B = 2^k\} = 2^{-2k}, \ k = 1, 2, \ldots, \quad \mathbf{P}\{A = 2^\ell, B = 0\} = 2^{-(2\ell+1)}, \ \ell = 0, 1, \ldots. \tag{15}$$

Indeed, assume that X is independent of (A, B). Then for $k \ge 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{AX + B = 2^k\} &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{P}\{A = 2^\ell, B = 0\} \, \mathbf{P}\{X = 2^{k-\ell}\} + \mathbf{P}\{A = 0, B = 2^k\} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} 2^{-(2\ell+1)} \, 2^{-(k-\ell)} + 2^{-2k} \\ &= 2^{-k-1} \, 2 \, (1 - 2^{-k}) + 2^{-2k} = 2^{-k}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\log A$ conditioned on A being nonzero is arithmetic with span $h = \log 2$, and

$$\mathbf{E}A = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{A = 2^k\} \, 2^k = 1, \ \mathbf{E}A \log_+ A < \infty, \ \mathbf{E}B < \infty.$$

That is the conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied with $\kappa = 1$. In this special case we see that $q(x) = 2^{\{\log_2 x\}}$.

What simplifies the analysis of the perpetuity equation with (A, B) in (15) is that $AB = 0$ a.s. It is worth mentioning that whenever $AB = 0$, $B \ge 0$ a.s. the solutions of perpetuity equation (1)

and maximum equation (2) take the same form $X = A_1 \dots A_{N-1} B_N$ for appropriate geometrically distributed N (see the proof of Proposition 1 for more details). In particular, the St. Petersburg distribution is the solution of (2) with (A, B) in (15).

Now we generalize this example and show that the set of all possible q functions in Theorems 2 and 3 contains the set of right-continuous nonzero functions in $\mathcal{Q}$.

Proposition 1. *Let $q, q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ right-continuous functions such that $q \neq 0$ and $q_1 + q_2 \neq 0$. Then there exists (A, B) satisfying the conditions of Theorem 2 such that for the tail of the unique solution of (1) the asymptotic (13) holds with the prescribed q_1, q_2. Furthermore, there exists (A, B) satisfying the conditions of Theorem 3 such that for the tail of the unique solution of (2) the asymptotic (14) holds with the prescribed q.*

In the proof of this statement we give an explicit construction of (A, B). In fact, for $\kappa = 1$, $h = \log 2$ the distribution of A is (almost) the same as in the example above, and only the distribution of B depends on q. When $q(x) \equiv q$ is constant, Lemma 1 implies that the tail of the solution X is regularly varying, more precisely $\mathbf{P}\{X > x\} \sim q x^{-\kappa}$ as $x \to \infty$. An explicit example is given in the proof of Proposition 1.

However, for general (A, B) it seems very difficult to determine q. It would be interesting to know what conditions on (A, B) imply that q is constant, or q is continuous, but these questions do not seem to be tractable with our methods.

2.2 Infinite mean case

Now we assume that F_κ in (4) belongs to the domain of attraction of an α-stable law with $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, that is

$$1 - F_\kappa(x) =: \overline{F}_\kappa(x) = \frac{\ell(x)}{x^\alpha}, \tag{16}$$

where ℓ is a slowly varying function. Furthermore, we assumat that the mean is infinite if $\alpha = 1$. Introduce the truncated expectation

$$m(x) = \int_0^x \overline{F}_\kappa(y) \mathrm{d}y. \tag{17}$$

Simple properties of regularly varying functions imply $m(x) \sim \ell(x) x^{1-\alpha}/(1-\alpha)$ for $\alpha \neq 1$, and m is slowly varying for $\alpha = 1$. Recall U from (6) and put $u_n = U(nh) - U(nh-)$. Note that $U(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, since the random walk $(S_n = \log A_1 + \ldots + \log A_n)_{n \geq 1}$ drifts to infinity under $\mathbf{P}_\kappa$ and $\mathbf{E}_\kappa[(\log A)_-]^2 < \infty$ by (5); see Theorem 2.1 by Kesten and Maller [21]. In this case the Blackwell theorem only states that $u_n \to 0$. The so-called strong renewal theorem (SRT) gives the exact rate, namely

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} u_n m(nh) = h\, C_\alpha, \quad C_\alpha = \frac{\sin(\alpha\pi)}{(1-\alpha)\pi}, \tag{18}$$

with the convention $C_1 = 1$. The first infinite mean SRT in the arithmetic case was shown by Garsia and Lamperti [15], who proved that (18) holds for $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$, and under some extra assumptions, for $\alpha \leq 1/2$. Their results were extended to the nonarithmetic case by Erickson [13], who also showed (18) for $\alpha = 1$, see [13, formula (2.4)]. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the SRT for nonnegative random variables were obtained by Caravenna [8] and Doney [11]. It was

pointed out in [22, Appendix] that their result extends to our case, where the random variable is not necessarily positive but the left tail is exponential. It turned out that if (16) holds with $\alpha \in (0, 1/2]$ then (18) holds if and only if

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{x\to\infty} x\overline{F}_\kappa(x) \int_1^{\delta x} \frac{1}{y\overline{F}_\kappa(y)^2} F_\kappa(x - \mathrm{d}y) = 0. \tag{19}$$

It is also shown in [8, 11] that for $\alpha > 1/2$ condition (19) automatically holds.

Summarizing, our assumptions on A are the following:

$$\begin{gathered} A \geq 0,\ \mathbf{E}A^\kappa = 1,\ \text{(16) and (19) holds for } F_\kappa \text{ for some } \kappa > 0 \text{ and } \alpha \in (0, 1], \\ \text{and } \log A \text{ conditioned on } A \neq 0 \text{ is arithmetic with span } h. \end{gathered} \tag{20}$$

Recall the definition of m from (17), and that m is regularly varying.

Theorem 4. *Assume (20) and for a random variable X*

$$\int_0^\infty y^{\kappa+\delta-1} |\mathbf{P}\{X > y\} - \mathbf{P}\{AX > y\}| \, \mathrm{d}y < \infty \tag{21}$$

for some $\delta > 0$, where A and X are independent. Then there exists a function $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m(nh)\, x^\kappa\, e^{\kappa n h}\, \mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q(x), \quad x \in C_q. \tag{22}$$

Since m is regularly varying, $m(\log x)$ is slowly varying, and $m(\log x + nh) \sim m(nh)$ as $n \to \infty$. For a continuous nonzero function q formula (22) implies

$$\mathbf{P}\{X > x\} \sim \frac{q(x)}{x^\kappa m(\log x)} \quad \text{as } x \to \infty.$$

As in Theorem 1 it is possible to give a stronger condition, similar to (10), which implies that (22) holds for all $x > 0$. However, in the corresponding key renewal theorem below (Lemma 2) besides summability a growth condition is also needed. Therefore the resulting stronger condition would be unnatural and it would not be clear how to check its validity neither for perpetuity equation (1) nor for maximum equation (2).

The maximum and perpetuity results are the following.

Theorem 5. *Assume (20) and $\mathbf{E}|B|^\nu < \infty$ for some $\nu > \kappa$. Let X be the unique solution of (2). Then there exists a function $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m(nh) x^\kappa e^{\kappa n h} \mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q(x), \quad x \in C_q.$$

If $B \geq 0$ a.s. and $\mathbf{P}\{B > 0\} > 0$ then $q(x) > 0$.

In the special case $B \equiv 1$ this theorem was obtained by Korshunov [23, Theorem 2].

Theorem 6. *Assume (20) and* $\mathbf{E}|B|^\nu < \infty$ *for some* $\nu > \kappa$. *Let* X *be the unique solution of (1). Then there exist functions* $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m(nh)x^\kappa e^{\kappa nh}\mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q_1(x), \quad x \in C_{q_1},$$
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m(nh)x^\kappa e^{\kappa nh}\mathbf{P}\{X < -xe^{nh}\} = q_2(x), \quad x \in C_{q_2}.$$

If $\mathbf{P}\{Ax + B = x\} < 1$ *for any* $x \in \mathbb{R}$ *then* $q_1(x) + q_2(x) > 0$.

Note that we only state convergence in continuity points in both cases.

The set of possible q functions contains the nonzero right-continuous functions in $\mathcal{Q}$, i.e. Proposition 1 is valid in this case too.

2.3 Beyond Cramér's condition

Assume now that $\mathbf{E}A^\kappa = \theta < 1$ for some $\kappa > 0$, and $\mathbf{E}A^t = \infty$ for any $t > \kappa$. The assumption $\mathbf{E}A^t = \infty$ for all $t > \kappa$ means that F_κ is heavy-tailed. The same renewal method leads now to a *defective* renewal equation. To analyze the asymptotic behavior of the resulting equation we extend the results by Asmussen, Foss and Korshunov [4, Section 6] to the arithmetic case.

Assume that H is the distribution function of an arithmetic random variable with span h. Let $p_k = H(kh) - H(kh-)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $p_k^{*2} = (H * H)(kh) - (H * H)(kh-)$. Then H is h-subexponential, $H \in \mathcal{S}_h$, if $p_{n+1} \sim p_n$ and $p_n^{*2} \sim 2p_n$ as $n \to \infty$. (According to the terminology introduced by Asmussen, Foss and Korshunov [4] for distributions on $[0, \infty)$ and by Foss, Korshunov and Zachary [14, Section 4.7] for distributions on $\mathbb{R}$, these distributions are $(0, h]$-subexponential.) In order to use a slight extension of Theorem 5 [4] we need the additional natural assumption $\sup_{k\ge n} p_k = O(p_n)$ as $n \to \infty$. Although in [4] the distributions are concentrated on $(0, \infty)$ the results remain true in our setup due to the extra growth assumption. We refer to [22, Appendix].

Our assumptions on A are the following:

$$\begin{gathered}\mathbf{E}A^\kappa = \theta < 1,\ \kappa > 0,\ F_\kappa \in \mathcal{S}_h,\ \sup_{k\ge n} p_k = O(p_n) \text{ as } n \to \infty,\\ \text{and } \log A \text{ conditioned on } A \neq 0 \text{ is arithmetic with span } h.\end{gathered} \tag{23}$$

Theorem 7. *Assume (23) and (21) for some* $\delta > 0$. *Then there exists a function* $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n^{-1}\, x^\kappa\, e^{\kappa nh}\, \mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q(x), \quad x \in C_q. \tag{24}$$

with $p_n = F_\kappa(nh) - F_\kappa(nh-)$.

For a possible stronger version of (24) which holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ see the comment after Theorem 4.

The corresponding maximum and perpetuity results are the following.

Theorem 8. *Assume (23) and* $\mathbf{E}|B|^\nu < \infty$ *for some* $\nu > \kappa$. *Let* X *be the unique solution of (2). Then there exists a function* $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n^{-1}\, x^\kappa\, e^{\kappa nh}\, \mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q(x), \quad x \in C_q.$$

If $B \ge 0$ *a.s. and* $\mathbf{P}\{B > 0\} > 0$ *then* $q(x) > 0$.

Theorem 9. *Assume (23) and* $\mathbf{E}|B|^\nu < \infty$ *for some* $\nu > \kappa$. *Let* X *be the unique solution of (1). Then there exist functions* $q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n^{-1}\, x^\kappa\, e^{\kappa n h}\, \mathbf{P}\{X > x e^{nh}\} = q_1(x), \quad x \in C_{q_1},$$
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} p_n^{-1}\, x^\kappa\, e^{\kappa n h}\, \mathbf{P}\{X < -x e^{nh}\} = q_2(x), \quad x \in C_{q_2},$$

with $p_n = F_\kappa(nh) - F_\kappa(nh-)$. *If* $\mathbf{P}\{Ax + B = x\} < 1$ *for any* $x \in \mathbb{R}$, *then* $q_1(x) + q_2(x) > 0$.

Proposition 1 remains true in this setup.

2.4 Iterated function systems

In this subsection we show that using Alsmeyer's sandwich method [1] our results extend naturally to a more general framework.

The Markov chain $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an *iterated function system of iid Lipschitz maps* (IFS) if $X_{n+1} = \Psi(\theta_{n+1}, X_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\theta, \theta_1, \theta_2, \ldots$ are iid random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$, the initial value X_0 is independent of the θ's, and $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function, which is Lipschitz continuous in the second argument, i.e. for all ϑ there exists $L_\vartheta > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$

$$|\Psi(\vartheta, x) - \Psi(\vartheta, y)| \leq L_\vartheta |x - y|.$$

For theory and examples (and for a more general definition) we refer to Alsmeyer [1], Buraczewski, Damek and Mikosch [7, Section 5] and to Diaconis and Freedman [10].

Under general conditions the stationary solution of the IFS exists and satisfies the random fixed point equation

$$X \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \Psi(\theta, X), \tag{25}$$

where θ and X on the right-hand side are independent. Therefore the corresponding implicit renewal theorem works and we obtain tail asymptotic for the solution X. The crucial difficulty here is the same as in the nonarithmetic case (see the remark after Theorem 2.3 [16]), namely to determine whether q is nonzero or not. For equations (1) and (2) there are reasonably good sufficient conditions for the strict positivity of the function q (of the constant, in the arithmetic case). The main idea in [1] is to find lower and upper bound for Ψ such that

$$Ax \vee B = F(\theta, x) \leq \Psi(\theta, x) \leq G(\theta, x) = Ax + B'$$

holds a.s. with some (random) A, B, B'. Now, if (A, B) and (A, B') satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3 and 2, respectively, then the tail of the solution X of (25) satisfies (9) with strictly positive q. In particular, Theorems 5.3 and 5.4 in [1] remain true in the arithmetic case.

Finally, we mention that there is no need to restrict ourselves to the finite mean case. Assuming (20) or (23) the corresponding version of Theorem 5.3 and 5.4 in [1] holds. The same results hold in the nonarithmetic case treated in [22].

3 Proofs

First we prove Lemma 1 and Proposition 1, since they are independent of the rest of the proofs.

Proof of Lemma 1. We show that every sequence $x_n \uparrow \infty$ contains a subsequence x_{n_k} such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} x_{n_k}^{\kappa} q^{-1}(x_{n_k}) \mathbf{P}\{X > x_{n_k}\} = 1.$$

This is equivalent to the statement.

Let us write $x_n = z_n e^{\ell_n h}$ with

$$z_n = \exp\left(h\left\{\frac{\log x_n}{h}\right\}\right), \quad \ell_n = \left\lfloor \frac{\log x_n}{h} \right\rfloor.$$

Since $z_n \in [1, e^h)$ by the Bolzano–Weierstrass theorem there is a subsequence n_k such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} z_{n_k} = \lambda \in [1, e^h]$. To ease the notation we write n for n_k. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is an n_ε such that $|z_n - \lambda| \le \varepsilon$ for $n \ge n_\varepsilon$. Therefore, using also (9)

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n^{\kappa} \mathbf{P}\{X > x_n\} &= \limsup_{n\to\infty} z_n^{\kappa} e^{\kappa \ell_n h} \mathbf{P}\{X > z_n e^{\ell_n h}\} \\
&\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{\lambda+\varepsilon}{\lambda-\varepsilon}\right)^{\kappa} (\lambda-\varepsilon)^{\kappa} e^{\kappa \ell_n h} \mathbf{P}\{X > (\lambda-\varepsilon) e^{\ell_n h}\} \\
&= \left(\frac{\lambda+\varepsilon}{\lambda-\varepsilon}\right)^{\kappa} q(\lambda-\varepsilon).
\end{aligned}$$

The same argument gives the corresponding lower bound. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary we obtain

$$q(\lambda+) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} x_n^{\kappa} \mathbf{P}\{X > x_n\} \le \limsup_{n\to\infty} x_n^{\kappa} \mathbf{P}\{X > x_n\} \le q(\lambda-). \tag{26}$$

Now the continuity of q implies the statement.

Note that (26) holds for general q. We did not use the continuity, only the logarithmic periodicity. □

Proof of Proposition 1. Motivated by the St. Petersburg example we assume that $h = \log 2$ and $\kappa = 1$. Moreover, we only prove the statement for the right tail. The general case follows easily from this.

Let H be a distribution function, such that $H(1-) = 0, H(2-) = 1$. Let the joint distribution of (A, B) be the following:

$$\mathbf{P}\{A = 2^\ell, B = 0\} = (1-2p)p^\ell,\ \ell = 0, 1, \ldots,\ \mathbf{P}\{A = 0, B \le x\} = \frac{p}{1-p} H(x),\ p \in (0, 1/2). \tag{27}$$

It is easy to check that (A, B) satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2 with $\kappa = 1$, $h = \log 2$. Let $(A, B), (A_1, B_1), \ldots$ iid random vectors with distribution given in (27). Since $AB = 0$ a.s. the solution of the perpetuity equation (1) can be written as

$$X = B_1 + A_1 B_2 + A_1 A_2 B_3 + \ldots = A_1 A_2 \ldots A_{N-1} B_N, \tag{28}$$

where $N = \min\{i : A_i = 0\}$ is a geometric random variable with parameter $\mathbf{P}\{A = 0\} = p/(1-p)$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{P}\{N = k\} = \frac{p}{1-p}\left(\frac{1-2p}{1-p}\right)^{k-1}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots.$$

From (28) we also see that the solution of (1) and of (2) are the same. Given that $N = k$ the variables $A_1, \dots, A_{k-1}, B_k$ are independent, $A_1, \dots, A_{k-1}$ have distribution $\mathbf{P}\{A = 2^\ell | A \neq 0\} = (1-p)p^\ell$, $\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and B_k has df H. To ease the notation we introduce the iid sequence $Y, Y_1, Y_2, \dots$ independent of $(A_i, B_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, such that $\mathbf{P}\{Y = \ell\} = (1-p)p^\ell$, $\ell = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and put $S_k = Y_1 + \ldots + Y_k$. Let $x > 1$ and write $x = 2^n z$ with $n = \lfloor \log_2 x \rfloor$, $z = 2^{\{\log_2 x\}}$. Since $B \in [1, 2)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}\{X > x\} &= \mathbf{P}\{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{N-1} B_N > x\} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{N = k\} \mathbf{P}\{A_1 A_2 \dots A_{k-1} B_k > x | N = k\} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{N = k\} \left(\mathbf{P}\{S_{k-1} \geq n+1\} + \mathbf{P}\{S_{k-1} = n\}[1 - H(z)]\right) \\
&= \mathbf{P}\{S_{N-1} \geq n+1\} + \mathbf{P}\{S_{N-1} = n\}[1 - H(z)].
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

We compute the probabilities $\mathbf{P}\{S_{N-1} = n\}$. By the independence of N and the Y's, after some straightforward calculation one has for $s \in [0, 1]$

$$\mathbf{E}s^{S_{N-1}} = \frac{1}{2(1-p)} + \frac{1-2p}{2(1-p)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{s^k}{2^k}.$$

That is

$$\mathbf{P}\{S_{N-1} = k\} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2(1-p)}, & k = 0, \\ \frac{1-2p}{2(1-p)} 2^{-k}, & k = 1, 2, \dots. \end{cases}$$

Thus $\mathbf{P}\{S_{N-1} \geq n+1\} = \frac{1-2p}{2(1-p)} 2^{-n}$, and so continuing (29) we have

$$\mathbf{P}\{X > x\} = x^{-1} \frac{1-2p}{2(1-p)} 2^{\{\log_2 x\}} [2 - H(2^{\{\log_2 x\}})]. \tag{30}$$

Let us choose now a right-continuous $q \in \mathcal{Q}$ (with the corresponding κ and h) such that $q(2-) \in (0, 1)$, otherwise q is arbitrary. Let us choose p, H in (27) as

$$p = 1 - [2 - q(2-)]^{-1}, \quad H(y) = \begin{cases} 0, & y < 1, \\ 2 - \frac{2(1-p)}{1-2p} \frac{q(y)}{y}, & y \in [1, 2), \\ 1, & y \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $q(y)/y$ is nonincreasing and right-continuous this is a distribution function. Substituting this back into (30) we see that the tail is as stated.

To get rid of the condition $q(2-) \in (0, 1)$ one only has to note that if $q(x)$ corresponds to (A, B) then $cq(x/c)$ corresponds to (A, cB), $c > 0$. Thus the proof is complete. □

In particular, with the choice

$$H(y) = \begin{cases} 0, & y \le 1, \\ 2 - \frac{2}{y}, & y \in [1,2], \\ 1, & y \ge 1, \end{cases}$$

in (27) we obtain $\mathbf{P}\{X > x\} = (2 - 1/(1-p))x^{-1}$, $x > 2$, which is regularly varying.

Proof of Theorem 1. We follow Grincevičius [17, Theorem 2] and Goldie [16, Theorem 2.3].

Introduce the notation

$$\psi(x) = e^{\kappa x}[\mathbf{P}\{X > e^x\} - \mathbf{P}\{AX > e^x\}], \quad f(x) = e^{\kappa x}\mathbf{P}\{X > e^x\}.$$

From the definition of ψ, using the independence of X and A we easily obtain the renewal equation

$$f(x) = \psi(x) + \mathbf{E}_\kappa f(x - \log A), \tag{31}$$

where $\mathbf{E}_\kappa$ stands for the expectation under the measure $\mathbf{P}_\kappa$ defined in (3). (See the proof of Theorem 3.2 in [16], or the proof of Theorem 5 in [22].) Introduce the smoothing of g as

$$\widehat{g}(s) = \int_{-\infty}^{s} e^{-(s-x)} g(x) \mathrm{d}x.$$

Applying this transform to both sides of (31) we get the renewal equation

$$\widehat{f}(s) = \widehat{\psi}(s) + \mathbf{E}_\kappa \widehat{f}(s - \log A). \tag{32}$$

For the solution we have (see again the proof of [22, Theorem 5])

$$\widehat{f}(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\psi}(s-y) U(\mathrm{d}y), \tag{33}$$

where $U(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_\kappa^{*n}(x)$ is the renewal function from (6).

In order to apply the key renewal theorem (Theorem 6.2.6 in [19]) we have to check that $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} |\widehat{\psi}(x + jh)| < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. This follows from the direct Riemann integrability of $\widehat{\psi}$, which is proved in the course of the proof of [22, Theorem 5]. For completeness and since we need the same calculation (without $|\cdot|$) we give a proof here. Using Fubini's theorem, after some calculation we have for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} |\widehat{\psi}(x+jh)| &\le \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} I(x + jh \ge y) e^{-(x+jh-y)} |\psi(y)| \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1-e^{-h}} e^{-(x-y) - h\lceil (y-x)/h \rceil} |\psi(y)| \mathrm{d}y \\ &\le \frac{1}{1-e^{-h}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\psi(y)| \mathrm{d}y < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we may apply the key renewal theorem and we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \widehat{f}(s+nh) = C(s). \tag{34}$$

where, using the same calculation as above

$$\begin{aligned} C(s) &= \frac{h}{\mu}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\psi}(s+jh) \\ &= \frac{h}{\mu}\frac{1}{1-e^{-h}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-(s-y)-h\lceil (y-s)/h\rceil}\psi(y)\mathrm{d}y \\ &= \frac{h}{\mu}\frac{1}{1-e^{-h}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-h\{(s-y)/h\}}\psi(y)\mathrm{d}y, \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

with $\mu = \mathbf{E}_\kappa \log A = \mathbf{E}A^\kappa \log A < \infty$.

We 'unsmooth' (34) the same way as in [17]. Using the definition of $\widehat{f}$, multiplying by e^s we obtain from (34) that for any $0 < s_1 \le s_2$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} e^{-nh}\int_{e^{s_1}e^{nh}}^{e^{s_2}e^{nh}} u^\kappa \mathbf{P}\{X > u\}\mathrm{d}u = e^{s_2}C(s_2) - e^{s_1}C(s_1).$$

Changing variables this reads

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{e^{s_1}}^{e^{s_2}} (ye^{nh})^\kappa \mathbf{P}\{X > ye^{nh}\}\mathrm{d}y = e^{s_2}C(s_2) - e^{s_1}C(s_1). \tag{36}$$

Since this holds for any $s_1 \le s_2$ we readily obtain that the integrand remains bounded, therefore there exists a subsequence $n_k \uparrow \infty$ and a function q such that $(ye^{n_k h})^\kappa \mathbf{P}\{X > ye^{n_k h}\} \to q(y)$ for any $y \in C_q$. As a limit of nonincreasing functions $q(y)y^{-\kappa}$ is nonincreasing. Moreover, from (36) we see that

$$\int_{e^{s_1}}^{e^{s_2}} q(y)\mathrm{d}y = e^{s_2}C(s_2) - e^{s_1}C(s_1), \tag{37}$$

which determines q uniquely at its continuity points. This implies that $(ye^{nh})^\kappa \mathbf{P}\{X > ye^{nh}\} \to q(y)$ holds true for the whole sequence of natural numbers whenever $y \in C_q$. From the latter we obtain the multiplicative periodicity $q(e^h y) = q(y)$. Since $y^{-\kappa}q(y)$ is nonincreasing C_q is at most countable. Thus the first statement is completely proved.

Assume now that $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} |\psi(x+jh)| < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there is no need for the smoothing. Indeed, we may apply the key renewal theorem directly for the equation (31) and we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} x^\kappa e^{\kappa nh}\mathbf{P}\{X > xe^{nh}\} = q(x),$$

which is exactly the statement. The stated properties of q follow easily. In fact

$$q(x) = \frac{h}{\mu}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \psi(\log x + jh). \tag{38}$$

□

Remark 1. Note that (37) implies $q(v) = (vC(\log v))'$ Lebesgue almost everywhere, from which, under some extra assumptions, some calculations give (38). Also note that $q(x) \equiv 0$ if and only if $vC(\log v)$ is constant. Since,

$$vC(\log v) = \frac{h}{\mu(1-e^{-h})} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{h\lfloor (\log v - y)/h \rfloor} e^y \psi(y) \mathrm{d}y,$$

we see that if ψ is nonnegative then $q(x) \equiv 0$ if and only if $\psi(y) \equiv 0$. This readily implies the positivity of the function q when $B \geq 0$ a.s. and $\mathbf{P}\{B > 0\} > 0$ in case of both the perpetuity equation (1) and the maximum equation (2).

Proof of Theorem 2. We only have to show that $q_1(x) + q_2(x) > 0$. Goldie's argument [16, p. 157] shows that it is enough to prove the positivity of the function for the maximum of the corresponding random walk. This was shown in [19, Theorem 1.3.8]. □

Proof of Theorem 4. Recall the notations from the proof of Theorem 1. Exactly the same way as in the previous proof we obtain the renewal equation (32), which has a unique bounded solution (33). We want to apply the key renewal theorem in the infinite mean case. In order to do so, we first have to prove such a result.

The following simple lemma is the arithmetic analogue of [13, Theorem 3], [18, Proposition 6.4.2], [22, Lemma 1]. We note that the statement holds under less restrictive condition on the left tail, see [18, Proposition 6.4.2]. However, for our purposes this weaker version is sufficient.

Lemma 2. *Assume (18) and (20). Let z be a function such that $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} |z(x+jh)| < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z(x) = O(x^{-1})$. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m(nh) \int_{\mathbb{R}} z(x+nh-y) U(\mathrm{d}y) = hC_\alpha \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} z(x+jh).$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}} z(x+nh-y)U(\mathrm{d}y) &= \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} z(x+nh-jh)u_j = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} z(x+kh)u_{n-k} \\ &= \Big(\sum_{k\leq 0} + \sum_{1\leq k\leq n} + \sum_{k>n}\Big) z(x+kh)u_{n-k} = I_1 + I_2 + I_3.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that m in (17) is regularly varying with parameter $1-\alpha$ and nondecreasing. For I_1

$$m(nh)I_1 = \sum_{k\leq 0} z(x+kh) m((n-k)h) u_{n-k} \frac{m(nh)}{m((n-k)h)} \to hC_\alpha \sum_{k\leq 0} z(x+kh),$$

since the summands converge and $m(nh)/m((n-k)h) \leq 1$, thus Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem applies. To handle I_2 let $1 > \delta > 0$ arbitrarily small. Then, from Potter bounds [6, Theorem 1.5.6] we obtain $\frac{m(nh)}{m((n-k)h)} \leq 2\delta^{-1}$ for n large enough and $k \leq (1-\delta)n$, thus by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem

$$\sum_{k=1}^{(1-\delta)n} z(x+kh) m((n-k)h) u_{n-k} \frac{m(nh)}{m((n-k)h)} \to hC_\alpha \sum_{k\geq 1} z(x+kh) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Furthermore, noting that $U(y) \sim \sin(\pi\alpha)/(\pi\alpha)\ y^\alpha/\ell(y)$ as $y \to \infty$, for some $c > 0$ we have

$$\sum_{k=(1-\delta)n}^{n} |z(x+kh)| m(nh) u_{n-k} \le \sup_{y>0} y|z(y)| \frac{m(nh)}{nh} U(\delta nh) \le c\delta^\alpha.$$

Since $\delta > 0$ is arbitrarily small, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m(nh) I_2 = hC_\alpha \sum_{k\ge 1} z(x+kh).$$

Finally, for I_3

$$m(nh) \sum_{k>n} |z(x+kh)| u_{n-k} \le \sup_{y>0} y|z(y)|\, U(0) \frac{m(nh)}{nh} \to 0.$$

□

In the proof of Theorem 5 [22] it is shown that under our conditions

$$\widehat{\psi}(s) = O(e^{-\delta s}) \quad \text{as } s \to \infty, \tag{39}$$

therefore the condition of Lemma 2 is satisfied, from which

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m(nh) \widehat{f}(s+nh) = C(s) := hC_\alpha \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\psi}(s+jh). \tag{40}$$

with the same C as in (35).

Using the definition of $\widehat{f}$, multiplying by e^s we obtain from (40) that for any $0 < s_1 \le s_2$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} m(nh) e^{-nh} \int_{e^{s_1}e^{nh}}^{e^{s_2}e^{nh}} u^\kappa \mathbf{P}\{X > u\} \mathrm{d}u = e^{s_2} C(s_2) - e^{s_1} C(s_1).$$

Changing variables this reads

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{e^{s_1}}^{e^{s_2}} m(nh) (ye^{nh})^\kappa \mathbf{P}\{X > ye^{nh}\} \mathrm{d}y = e^{s_2} C(s_2) - e^{s_1} C(s_1).$$

As in the previous proof this implies that $m(nh)(ye^{nh})^\kappa \mathbf{P}\{X > ye^{nh}\} \to q(y)$ holds true for the whole sequence of natural numbers whenever $y \in C_q$ with some q, which satisfies the stated properties. □

Proof of Theorems 5 and 6. We only have to prove that the assumptions imply the integrability condition in Theorem 4. This is done in the proof of Theorem 1 and 2 in [22].

Remark 1 implies $q(x) > 0$ in Theorem 5. Now, the strict positivity of $q_1(x) + q_2(x)$ follows again from Goldie's argument [16, p.157] and from the just proved positivity of q in Theorem 5. □

Before the proof of Theorem 7 we need a key renewal theorem in the arithmetic case for defective distribution functions. The following statement is an extension to the arithmetic case of Theorem 5(i) [4]. Recall p_n from Theorem 7.

Lemma 3. *Assume (23),* $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}|z(x+jh)|<\infty$ *for any* $x\in\mathbb{R}$ *and* $\sup_{x\in[0,h]}z(x+nh)=o(p_n)$ *as* $n\to\infty$. *Let* $U(x)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(\theta F_\kappa)^{*n}(x)$. *Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}p_n^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}}z(x+nh-y)U(\mathrm{d}y)=\frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)^2}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}z(x+jh).$$

Proof. Note that Proposition 12 [4] remains true in our case. Therefore

$$u_n=U(nh)-U(nh-)\sim\frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)^2}[F_\kappa(nh)-F_\kappa(nh-)]=\frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)^2}p_n. \tag{41}$$

Since $\lim_{n\to\infty}p_n/p_{n+1}=1$, there is sequence $\ell_n<n/2$ tending to infinity such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\max_{|\ell|\le\ell_n}u_n/u_{n+\ell}=1.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{|\ell|\le\ell_n}z(x+\ell h)u_{n-\ell}\sim u_n\sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}}z(x+\ell h)\sim\frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)^2}p_n\sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}}z(x+\ell h).$$

Thus we only have to show that the remaining terms are $o(p_n)$. For $\ell\le-\ell_n$ using that $\max_{k\ge n}p_k=O(p_n)$ we obtain

$$\sum_{\ell\le-\ell_n}z(x+\ell h)u_{n-\ell}=O(p_n)o(1).$$

Using $z(x+nh)=o(p_n)$, (41) and Proposition 2 in [4]

$$\sum_{\ell=\ell_n}^{n-\ell_n}z(x+\ell h)u_{n-\ell}=o(1)\sum_{\ell=\ell_n}^{n-\ell_n}p_\ell p_{n-\ell}=o(p_n).$$

Finally, $z(x+nh)=o(p_n)$ and $\max_{k\ge n}p_k=O(p_n)$ imply

$$\sum_{\ell>n-\ell_n}z(x+\ell h)u_{n-\ell}=o(p_n),$$

and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 7. Following the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 1 we obtain

$$\widehat{f}(s)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\widehat{\psi}(s-y)U(\mathrm{d}y),$$

with the defective renewal function $U(x)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(\theta F_\kappa)^{*n}(x)$. Since $\theta<1$ we have $U(\mathbb{R})=(1-\theta)^{-1}<\infty$.

As in (39) we have $\widehat{\psi}(x)=O(e^{-\delta x})$ for some $\delta>0$. The subexponentiality of F_κ implies that $\sup_{x\in[0,h]}\widehat{\psi}(x+nh)=o(p_n)$. That is, the condition of Lemma 3 holds, and we obtain the asymptotic

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}p_n^{-1}\widehat{f}(s+nh)=\frac{\theta}{(1-\theta)^2}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\widehat{\psi}(s+jh).$$

The proof can be finished in exactly the same way as in Theorem 4. □

Proof of Theorems 8 and 9. Again, the integrability condition in Theorem 7 follows from the proof of Theorem 3 and 4 in [22]. The positivity of the functions follow as before. □

Acknowledgement. I thank Alexander Iksanov for suggesting the problem, and for his comments, which greatly improved the paper. This research was funded by a postdoctoral fellowship of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

References

[1] G. Alsmeyer. On the stationary tail index of iterated random Lipschitz functions. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 126(1):209–233, 2016.

[2] G. Alsmeyer, J. D. Biggins, and M. Meiners. The functional equation of the smoothing transform. *Ann. Probab.*, 40(5):2069–2105, 2012.

[3] S. Asmussen. *Applied probability and queues*, volume 51 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2003. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability.

[4] S. Asmussen, S. Foss, and D. Korshunov. Asymptotics for sums of random variables with local subexponential behaviour. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 16(2):489–518, 2003.

[5] I. Berkes, L. Györfi, and P. Kevei. Tail probabilities of St. Petersburg sums, trimmed sums, and their limit. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 2016.

[6] N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie, and J. L. Teugels. *Regular variation*, volume 27 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.

[7] D. Buraczewski, E. Damek, and T. Mikosch. *Stochastic Models with Power-Law Tails. The Equation X=AX+B.* Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, 2016.

[8] F. Caravenna. The strong renewal theorem. Available on arXiv: http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.07502, 2015.

[9] S. Csörgő. Rates of merge in generalized St. Petersburg games. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 68(3-4):815–847, 2002.

[10] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman. Iterated random functions. *SIAM Rev.*, 41(1):45–76, 1999.

[11] R. A. Doney. The strong renewal theorem with infinite mean via local large deviations. Available on arXiv: http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.06790, 2015.

[12] R. Durrett and T. M. Liggett. Fixed points of the smoothing transformation. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, 64(3):275–301, 1983.

[13] K. B. Erickson. Strong renewal theorems with infinite mean. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 151:263–291, 1970.

[14] S. Foss, D. Korshunov, and S. Zachary. *An introduction to heavy-tailed and subexponential distributions*. Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York, second edition, 2013.

[15] A. Garsia and J. Lamperti. A discrete renewal theorem with infinite mean. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 37:221–234, 1962/1963.

[16] C. M. Goldie. Implicit renewal theory and tails of solutions of random equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 1(1):126–166, 1991.

[17] A. K. Grincevičius. One limit distribution for a random walk on the line. *Lithuanian Mathematical Journal*, 15(4):580–589, 1975.

[18] A. Iksanov. *Perpetuities, branching random walk and selfdecomposability.* In Ukranian. KTI-PRINT: Kiev, 2007.

[19] A. Iksanov. Perturbed random walks, perpetuities and random processes with immigration. Preprint is available at author's homepage, 2016.

[20] H. Kesten. Random difference equations and renewal theory for products of random matrices. *Acta Math.*, 131:207–248, 1973.

[21] H. Kesten and R. A. Maller. Two renewal theorems for general random walks tending to infinity. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 106(1):1–38, 1996.

[22] P. Kevei. A note on the Kesten–Grincevičius–Goldie theorem. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 21(51):1–12, 2016.

[23] D. A. Korshunov. The critical case of the Cramér-Lundberg theorem on the asymptotics of the distribution of the maximum of a random walk with negative drift. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 46(6):1335–1340, 2005.

[24] K.-S. Lau and C. R. Rao. Integrated Cauchy functional equation and characterizations of the exponential law. *Sankhyā Ser. A*, 44(1):72–90, 1982.

[25] M. M. Meerschaert and H.-P. Scheffler. *Limit distributions for sums of independent random vectors.* Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 2001. Heavy tails in theory and practice.

[26] Z. Megyesi. A probabilistic approach to semistable laws and their domains of partial attraction. *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)*, 66(1-2):403–434, 2000.

[27] Z. Megyesi. Domains of geometric partial attraction of max-semistable laws: structure, merge and almost sure limit theorems. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 15(4):973–1005, 2002.